

## REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 1-3, 7-12, 14, 16, 21-28, 30, 32, 33 35, and 36 were pending at the time of this Office Action.
- Claims 33 and 35 are canceled herein.
- Claims 1, 7, 16, 21, 22, 24, 27, 28, 32, and 36 are amended herein.
- Claims 1-3, 7-12, 14, 16, 21-28, 30, 32, and 36 are currently pending.

Support for the amendments to claims 1, 16, 28, 32, and 36 is found in the specification, as originally filed, at least at page 3, lines 28-31; page 7, lines 16-20; page 9, lines 5-17; and page 15, lines 3-13. Additional support for the amendments to claim 28 is found in the specification, as originally filed, at least at page 11, lines 3-5. The amendments submitted herein do not introduce any new matter.

## Cited Documents

The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application:

- **Dunkle:** U.S. Patent No. 6,288,717
- **Brown:** U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0157026
- **Uchiyama:** U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0065802

**Claims 1-3, 7-11, 14, 16, 21-27, 29, 32, and 36 are Non-Obvious Over Dunkle  
in view of Brown**

Claims 1-3, 7-11, 14, 16, 21-23, 24-27, 29-30, 32-33, and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Dunkle in view of Brown. Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claims 29 and 33 is moot because these claims have been canceled. In addition, Applicant addresses the rejection of claim 30, which depends from independent claim 28, in conjunction with the rejection of claim 28 over Dunkle, Brown, and Uchiyama below. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the remaining claims in light of the amendments presented herein.

**Independent Claim 1**

Claim 1, as amended herein, recites (with added text underlined):

A computer implemented system comprising:

a processor communicatively coupled to a memory, said memory having stored thereon computer-executable instructions configured to implement a profile building system, the profile building system including:

an extraction component to extract semantic components of at least a portion of a plurality of web pages;

an input component comprising a user interface button having an appearance corresponding to context of each of the plurality of web pages based in part on the semantic components of the at least a portion of the plurality of web pages, the user interface button having a first appearance corresponding to a first context of a first web page and having a second appearance corresponding to a second context of a second web page, the first context being different from the second context and the first appearance being different from the second appearance; and

a profile component to populate and store the profile of the user and to indicate selection by the user of the user interface button with respect to one or more of the plurality of web pages.

In rejecting the features of claim 1 directed to the input component, the Office relies on col. 5, ll. 29-32. (Office Action, p. 3). Specifically, page 3 of the Office Action states, in part:

With regard to claim 1, Dunkle discloses...at least one input component comprising a plurality of user interface buttons to automatically reflect context to the user of the web page based in part on the semantic components of the at least one portion of the web page, to receive the user's selection of one or more of the plurality of user interface buttons (Dunkle: Column 5, lines 29-32. The button states "Rate This Article," which reflects the context of the page, which is an article. The button then links to a dialogue box that requests multiple pieces of items from the user in the form of ratings, which would constitute a plurality of buttons that reflect the context of the page.

However, in contrast to claim 1, the cited portions of Dunkle describe "a 'Rate This Article' button linked to a dialog box that invites the members to rate the article." (Dunkle, col. 5, ll. 29-31). Applicant respectfully submits that the cited portions of Dunkle do not teach or suggest "an input component comprising a user interface button having an appearance corresponding to context of each of the plurality of web pages based in part on the semantic components of the at least a portion of the plurality of web pages, the user interface button having a first appearance corresponding to a first context of a first web page and having a second appearance corresponding to a second context of a second web page, the first context being different from the second context

and the first appearance being different from the second appearance,” as recited in claim 1, as amended. That is, Dunkle does not specifically teach “a user interface button having an appearance corresponding to context of each of the plurality of web pages based in part on the semantic components of the at least a portion of the plurality of web pages.” In particular, the appearance of the “Rate This Article” button is not based on the context of web pages. Rather, Dunkle merely describes providing a “Rate This Article” button on an article detail page. There is no correlation in Dunkle between the appearance of the “Rate This Article” button and the web pages being rated. Further, the “Rate This Article” button of Dunkle does not change appearance as a user navigates to web pages that have different contexts.

Additionally, the cited portions of Brown are neither cited for nor provide any teaching or suggestion corresponding to “an input component comprising a user interface button having an appearance corresponding to context of each of the plurality of web pages based in part on the semantic components of the at least a portion of the plurality of web pages, the user interface button having a first appearance corresponding to a first context of a first web page and having a second appearance corresponding to a second context of a second web page, the first context being different from the second context and the first appearance being different from the second appearance,” as recited in claim 1, as amended. Rather, the cited portions of Brown describe sharing options provided to a user such that “the user can then identify the level of access that will be extended to web site hosts during visits to their web sites.” (Brown, paragraph [0038]).

For at least the reasons presented herein, the combination of Dunkle and Brown does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the 103 rejection of claim 1.

Dependent Claims 2, 3, 7-11, and 14

Claims 2, 3, 7-11, and 14 ultimately depend from independent claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 2, 3, 7-11, and 14 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the 103 rejection of claims 2, 3, 7-11, and 14.

Independent Claim 16

Claim 16, as amended herein, recites (with added text underlined):

A computer-implemented method comprising:

extracting first semantic components from at least one portion of a first web page;

providing one or more first input components comprising one or more first user interface buttons, each of the first user interface buttons having an appearance corresponding to a context of the first web page based in part on the first semantic components;

receiving selection by the user of at least one of the first user interface buttons;

extracting second semantic components from at least a portion of a second web page;

providing one or more second input components comprising one or more second user interface buttons, each of the second user interface buttons having an appearance corresponding to a context of the second web page based in part on the second web page semantic components, at

least one of the second user interface buttons having a respective appearance that is different from a respective appearance of at least one of the first user interface buttons;

receiving selection by the user of at least one of the second user interface buttons; and

populating the user profile based, at least in part, on the selection of the at least one first user interface button and the selection of the at least one second user interface button.

In rejecting the features of claim 16, the Office states "With regard to claims 16 and 24-27, the instant claims are substantially similar to subject matter presented in claims 1, 5, 6, 7, and 8, and are rejected for substantially similar reasons." (Office Action, p. 6). Thus, with respect to the features of claim 16 directed to the first and second input components, the Office appears to rely on col. 5, ll. 29-32 of Dunkle. Specifically, page 3 of the Office Action states, in part:

With regard to claim 1, Dunkle discloses...at least one input component comprising a plurality of user interface buttons to automatically reflect context to the user of the web page based in part on the semantic components of the at least one portion of the web page, to receive the user's selection of one or more of the plurality of user interface buttons (Dunkle: Column 5, lines 29-32. The button states "Rate This Article," which reflects the context of the page, which is an article. The button then links to a dialogue box that requests multiple pieces of items from the user in the form of ratings, which would constitute a plurality of buttons that reflect the context of the page.

However, in contrast to claim 16, the cited portions of Dunkle describe "a 'Rate This Article' button linked to a dialog box that invites the members to rate the article."

(Dunkle, col. 5, ll. 29-31). Applicant respectfully submits that the cited portions of Dunkle do not teach or suggest “providing one or more first input components comprising one or more first user interface buttons, each of the first user interface buttons having an appearance corresponding to a context of the first web page based in part on the first semantic components...[and] providing one or more second input components comprising one or more second user interface buttons, each of the second user interface buttons having an appearance corresponding to a context of the second web page based in part on the second web page semantic components, at least one of the second user interface buttons having a respective appearance that is different from a respective appearance of at least one of the first user interface buttons,” as recited in claim 16, as amended. That is, Dunkle does not specifically teach “first user interface buttons having an appearance corresponding to a context of the first web page based in part on the first semantic components” or “second user interface buttons having an appearance corresponding to a context of the second web page based in part on the second web page semantic components.” In particular, the appearance of the “Rate This Article” button is not based on the context of web pages. Rather, Dunkle merely describes providing a “Rate This Article” button on an article detail page. There is no correlation in Dunkle between the appearance of the “Rate This Article” button and the web pages being rated. Further, the “Rate This Article” button of Dunkle does not change appearance as a user navigates to different web pages.

Additionally, the cited portions of Brown are neither cited for nor provide any teaching or suggestion corresponding to “providing one or more first input components comprising one or more first user interface buttons, each of the first user interface

buttons having an appearance corresponding to a context of the first web page based in part on the first semantic components...[and] providing one or more second input components comprising one or more second user interface buttons, each of the second user interface buttons having an appearance corresponding to a context of the second web page based in part on the second web page semantic components, at least one of the second user interface buttons having a respective appearance that is different from a respective appearance of at least one of the first user interface buttons,” as recited in claim 16, as amended. Rather, the cited portions of Brown describe sharing options provided to a user such that “the user can then identify the level of access that will be extended to web site hosts during visits to their web sites.” (Brown, paragraph [0038]).

For at least the reasons presented herein, the combination of Dunkle and Brown does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 16. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the 103 rejection of claim 16.

#### Dependent Claims 21-27

Claims 21-27 ultimately depend from independent claim 16. As discussed above, claim 16 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 21-27 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the 103 rejection of claims 21-27.



Independent Claim 32

Claim 32, as amended herein, recites (with added text underlined):

A computer-readable storage medium having stored thereon instructions executable by a processor to perform operations comprising:

extracting semantic components of at least a portion of a web page;

providing content of the web page via a user interface, the user interface including a button having an appearance corresponding to context of the web page based on the semantic components, the button being selectable to indicate a respective declaration about the content of the web page; and

automatically populating a profile of a user in response to selection of the button.

In rejecting the features of claim 32, the Office states "With regard to claim 32, the instant claim is substantially similar to subject matter presented in claim 1 and is rejected for substantially similar reasons." (Office Action, p. 8). Thus, with respect to the features of claim 32 directed to the button of the user interface, the Office appears to rely on col. 5, ll. 29-32 of Dunkle. Specifically, page 3 of the Office Action states, in part:

With regard to claim 1, Dunkle discloses...at least one input component comprising a plurality of user interface buttons to automatically reflect context to the user of the web page based in part on the semantic components of the at least one portion of the web page, to receive the user's selection of one or more of the plurality of user interface buttons (Dunkle: Column 5, lines 29-32. The button states "Rate This Article," which reflects the context of the page, which is an article. The button then links to a dialogue box that requests multiple pieces of items from the user

in the form of ratings, which would constitute a plurality of buttons that reflect the context of the page.

However, in contrast to claim 32, the cited portions of Dunkle describe “a ‘Rate This Article’ button linked to a dialog box that invites the members to rate the article.” (Dunkle, col. 5, ll. 29-31). Applicant respectfully submits that the cited portions of Dunkle do not teach or suggest “providing content of the web page via a user interface, the user interface including a button having an appearance corresponding to context of the web page based on the semantic components, the button being selectable to indicate a respective declaration about the content of the web page,” as recited in claim 32, as amended. That is, Dunkle does not specifically teach “a button having an appearance corresponding to context of the web page based on the semantic components.” In particular, the appearance of the “Rate This Article” button is not based on the context of the web page. Rather, Dunkle merely describes providing a “Rate This Article” button on an article detail page. There is no correlation in Dunkle between the appearance of the “Rate This Article” button and the web pages being rated.

Further, Dunkle does not teach or suggest “automatically populating a profile of a user in response to selection of the button,” as recited in claim 32, as amended. In contrast, Dunkle describes that the “Rate This Article” button is linked to “a dialog box that invites the member to rate the article...The data collected from members in this dialog box will be used to give the algorithm a deeper understanding of member’s preferences.” Thus, in Dunkle, a profile of a user is not automatically populated in response to selection of a button, but rather selection of the “Rate This Article” button is

an intermediate step to the actual collection of data about a member from the dialog box.

Additionally, the cited portions of Brown are neither cited for nor provide any teaching or suggestion corresponding to “providing content of the web page via a user interface, the user interface including a button having an appearance corresponding to context of the web page based on the semantic components, the button being selectable to indicate a respective declaration about the content of the web page; and automatically populating a profile of a user in response to selection of the button,” as recited in claim 32, as amended. Rather, the cited portions of Brown describe sharing options provided to a user such that “the user can then identify the level of access that will be extended to web site hosts during visits to their web sites.” (Brown, paragraph [0038]).

For at least the reasons presented herein, the combination of Dunkle and Brown does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 32. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the 103 rejection of claim 32.

### Independent Claim 36

Claim 36, as amended herein, recites (with added text underlined):

A computer implemented system comprising:

a processor communicatively coupled to a memory, said memory having stored

thereon computer-executable instructions configured to implement the profile building system, the profile building system including:

at least one extraction component to extract first semantic components of at least one portion of a first web page and to extract second semantic components of at least a portion of a second web page;

at least one input component comprising a plurality of user interface buttons, each of the user interface buttons having an appearance corresponding to a context of the first web page based in part on the first semantic components when the first web page is being viewed, at least one of the user interface buttons morphing based on differences between the first semantic components and the second semantic components when the second web page is being viewed, and each of the user interface buttons is selectable to indicate an emotional response of the user, an experience of the user, a desire of the user, a philosophy of the user, a preference of the user, a goal of the user, an opinion of the user, relevance to the user, a theology of the user, an insight of the user, a conception of the user, or combinations thereof; and

a profile component to populate the profile of the user based on selection by the user of one or more of the plurality of user interface buttons.

In rejecting the features of claim 36, the Office states, in part "With regard to claim 36, the instant claim includes subject matter that is substantially similar to claim 1 and is rejected for substantially similar reasons." (Office Action, p. 8). Thus, with respect to the features of claim 36 directed to the at least one input component, the Office appears to rely on col. 5, ll. 29-32 of Dunkle. Specifically, page 3 of the Office Action states, in part:

With regard to claim 1, Dunkle discloses...at least one input component comprising a plurality of user interface buttons to automatically reflect context to the user of the web page based in part on the semantic components of the at least one portion of the web page, to receive the user's selection of one or more of the plurality of user interface buttons (Dunkle: Column 5, lines 29-32. The button states "Rate This Article,"

which reflects the context of the page, which is an article. The button then links to a dialogue box that requests multiple pieces of items from the user in the form of ratings, which would constitute a plurality of buttons that reflect the context of the page.

However, in contrast to claim 36, the cited portions of Dunkle describe “a ‘Rate This Article’ button linked to a dialog box that invites the members to rate the article.” (Dunkle, col. 5, ll. 29-31). Applicant respectfully submits that the cited portions of Dunkle do not teach or suggest “at least one input component comprising a plurality of user interface buttons, each of the user interface buttons having an appearance corresponding to a context of the first web page based in part on the first semantic components when the first web page is being viewed, at least one of the user interface buttons morphing based on differences between the first semantic components and the second semantic components when the second web page is being viewed,” as recited in claim 36, as amended. That is, Dunkle does not specifically teach “each of the user interface buttons having an appearance corresponding to a context of the first web page based in part on the first semantic components when the first web page is being viewed.” In particular, the appearance of the “Rate This Article” button is not based on the context of a web page. Rather, Dunkle merely describes providing a “Rate This Article” button on an article detail page. There is no correlation in Dunkle between the appearance of the “Rate This Article” button and the web pages being rated. Further, the “Rate This Article” button of Dunkle does not morph based on differences between the first semantic components of a first web page and the second semantic components of a second web page when the second web page is being viewed.

Additionally, the cited portions of Brown are neither cited for nor provide any teaching or suggestion corresponding to "at least one input component comprising a plurality of user interface buttons, each of the user interface buttons having an appearance corresponding to a context of the first web page based in part on the first semantic components when the first web page is being viewed, at least one of the user interface buttons morphing based on differences between the first semantic components and the second semantic components when the second web page is being viewed" as recited in claim 36, as amended. Rather, the cited portions of Brown describe sharing options provided to a user such that "the user can then identify the level of access that will be extended to web site hosts during visits to their web sites." (Brown, paragraph [0038]).

For at least the reasons presented herein, the combination of Dunkle and Brown does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 36. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the 103 rejection of claim 36.

**Claims 12, 28, and 30 are Non-Obvious Over Dunkle in view of Brown and further in view of Uchiyama**

Claims 12-13, 28, and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Dunkle in view of Brown and further in view of Uchiyama. Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections of claims 13 and 35 are moot because these claims have been canceled. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the remaining claims in light of the amendments presented herein.

### Dependent Claim 12

Claim 12 depends from independent claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is allowable over the combination of Dunkle and Brown. Uchiyama is cited for its alleged teaching of the respective features of dependent claim 12: “a privacy-preserving searching component to enable the user to search for others who have a similar profile as the user.” However, Uchiyama fails to remedy the deficiencies of Dunkle and Brown as noted above with regard to independent claim 1. For example, the cited portions of Uchiyama do not teach or suggest “an input component comprising a user interface button having an appearance corresponding to context of each of the plurality of web pages based in part on the semantic components of the at least a portion of the plurality of web pages, the user interface button having a first appearance corresponding to a first context of a first web page and having a second appearance corresponding to a second context of a second web page, the first context being different from the second context and the first appearance being different from the second appearance,” as recited in claim 1. Rather, the cited portions of Uchiyama describe “employ[ing] both explicit and implicit data in users’ profiles to connect users with common interests, similar personalities, or mutual friends” and a mechanism “to disable the implicit data collection functionality of the system”. (Uchiyama, paragraphs [0040] and [0108]).

Therefore, claim 12 is also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least its dependency from an allowable base claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the 103 rejection of claim 12.

Independent Claim 28

Claim 28, as amended herein, recites (with added text underlined):

A computer-implemented method comprising:

receiving agreement from a user to opt-in to a user profile system;  
adding a button to a user interface, at least partly in response to  
receiving the agreement from the user to opt-in to the user profile system,  
the button having an appearance corresponding to a context of web pages  
viewed by the user via the user interface;

browsing information stored on a web page via the user interface;  
receiving selection of the button on the user interface, the selection  
of the button indicating a declaration about at least one portion of the web  
page; and

populating a personal profile of the user with the at least one  
declaration.

In rejecting the features of claim 28, the Office states "With regard to claim 28, the instant claim is substantially similar to the invention claimed in claim 8, and is thus, rejected for substantially similar reasons." (Office Action, p. 11). Since claim 8 depends from claim 1, it appears that the features of claim 28 generally directed to a button on a user interface are rejected based on col. 5, ll. 29-32 of Dunkle. Specifically, page 3 of the Office Action states, in part:

With regard to claim 1, Dunkle discloses...at least one input component comprising a plurality of user interface buttons to automatically reflect context to the user of the web page based in part on the semantic components of the at least one portion of the web page, to receive the user's selection of one or more of the plurality of user interface buttons (Dunkle: Column 5, lines 29-32. The button states "Rate This Article,"



which reflects the context of the page, which is an article. The button then links to a dialogue box that requests multiple pieces of items from the user in the form of ratings, which would constitute a plurality of buttons that reflect the context of the page.

However, in contrast to claim 28, the cited portions of Dunkle describe “a ‘Rate This Article’ button linked to a dialog box that invites the members to rate the article.” (Dunkle, col. 5, ll. 29-31). Applicant respectfully submits that the cited portions of Dunkle do not teach or suggest “adding a button to a user interface, at least partly in response to receiving the agreement from the user to opt-in to the user profile system, the button having an appearance corresponding to a context of web pages viewed by the user via the user interface,” as recited in claim 28, as amended. That is, Dunkle does not specifically teach “the button having an appearance corresponding to a context of web pages viewed by the user via the user interface.” In particular, the appearance of the “Rate This Article” button is not based on the context of web pages. Rather, Dunkle merely describes providing a “Rate This Article” button on an article detail page. There is no correlation in Dunkle between the appearance of the “Rate This Article” button and the web pages being rated. Further, Applicant respectfully submits that the Office has not examined nor does Dunkle teach or suggest the features added to claim 28 directed to “receiving agreement from a user to opt-in to a user profile system” and “adding a button to a user interface, at least partly in response to receiving the agreement from the user to opt-in to the user profile system.”

Additionally, the cited portions of Brown are neither cited for nor provide any teaching or suggestion corresponding to “adding a button to a user interface, at least partly in response to receiving the agreement from the user to opt-in to the user profile

system, the button having an appearance corresponding to a context of web pages viewed by the user via the user interface,” as recited in claim 28, as amended. Rather, the cited portions of Brown describe sharing options provided to a user such that “the user can then identify the level of access that will be extended to web site hosts during visits to their web sites.” (Brown, paragraph [0038]).

Uchiyama does not make up for the deficiencies of Dunkle and Brown with respect to claim 28. In particular, in contrast to claim 28, Uchiyama describes a tool bar that may include one or more voting buttons, such as a “voting button [that] is signified by a heart in the tool bar.” (Uchiyama, paragraph [0107]). However, Uchiyama does not teach or suggest “adding a button to a user interface, at least partly in response to receiving the agreement from the user to opt-in to the user profile system, the button having an appearance corresponding to a context of web pages viewed by the user via the user interface,” as recited in claim 28, as amended. That is, Uchiyama does not specifically teach “the button having an appearance corresponding to a context of web pages viewed by the user via the user interface.” In particular, the appearance of the voting button of Uchiyama is not based on the context of web pages.

Additionally, Uchiyama provides no teaching corresponding to “adding a button to a user interface, at least partly in response to receiving the agreement from the user to opt-in to the user profile system.” Rather, Uchiyama merely describes “install[ing] an additional frame in the GUI, such as the tool bar.” (Uchiyama, paragraph [0105]). Thus, the installation of the tool bar in Uchiyama is not in response to “receiving the agreement from the user to opt-in to the user profile system.”

For at least the reasons presented herein, the combination of Dunkle, Brown, and Uchiyama does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 28. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the 103 rejection of claim 28.

*Dependent Claim 30*

Claim 30 depends from independent claim 28. As discussed above, claim 28 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claim 30 is also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least its dependency from an allowable base claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the 103 rejection of claim 30.

## **Conclusion**

For at least the foregoing reasons, all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application.

If any issues remain that would prevent allowance of this application, **Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned representative before issuing a subsequent Action.**

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC  
Representative for Applicant

/Trevor E. Lind 54785/

Dated: June 28, 2011

Trevor E. Lind  
(trevor@leehayes.com; 512-505-8162 x5003)  
Registration No. 54785

Lewis C. Lee  
(lewis@leehayes.com; 509-944-4711)  
Registration No. 34656